

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **June 2, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-34. Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jones (USPN 5,684,984, hereinafter "Jones"). Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-34 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 to remove the rejected limitations.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 were rejected as being anticipated by Jones. Applicant respectfully points out that Jones teaches distributing change information **at a set time or on demand** (see Jones, col. 4, lines 7-14). Additionally, Jones teaches initiating a new connection to send changes to a central service via a dial-up connection using a specified telephone number (see Jones, col. 4, lines 20-22).

In contrast, the present invention sends changes to a second system **upon detecting that the object has been changed** without the first system having to initiate a new connection with the second system (see FIG. 3, block 309 and page 7, lines 23-28 of the instant application). This is advantageous because it ensures that the second system is brought up-to-date immediately, without having to wait for the set time or make a demand for the update and without having to establish a new connection with the second system.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 to clarify that the present invention sends changes to a second system upon detecting that the object has been changed without the first system having to initiate a new connection with the second system. These amendments find support in FIG. 3, block 309 and on page 7, lines 23-28 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-20, which depend upon claim 12, claims 22-27, which depend upon claim 21, and claims 29-31, which depend upon claim 28, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: July 14, 2004

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665